UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,681	07/24/2001	Feng-Qi Lai	2100632-991121	8234

7590 08/12/2004

TIMOTHY W. LOHSE
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENCRICH
PATENT DEPARTMENT - EM
1755 EMBARCADERO ROAD
PALO, CA 94303

EXAMINER	
HARRIS, CHANDA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/912,681	LAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chanda L. Harris	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 May 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 19-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 19-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/31/02, 7/31/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

In response to the amendment filed on 5/24/04, Claims 1-17 and 19-47 (Group II) are elected. Claims 18 and 48-481 are cancelled. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 5/24/04 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 7/31/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. No copy has been provided of the marked-through documents on the information disclosure statement.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The status of application number 09/350,791 needs to be updated on the first page of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 29-37, 38-39, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claim 29 recites the limitation "the data associated with one or more tests" in Lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 38 recites the limitation "the server computer" in Lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 45 recites the limitation "the diagnostic system" in Line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-17 and 19-47 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-17 and 19-47 of copending Application No. 10/713,755. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-17 and 19-47 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-17 and 19-47 of copending Application No. 10/713, 676. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 12, 19-21, 23-29, 33-38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Corder (US 5,692,906).

1. [Claims 1,38]: Regarding Claims 1 and 38, Corder discloses a portable media disk (i.e., a disk upon which environmental sounds and other test materials are stored) that is capable of storing instructions for one or more tests for determining deficiencies in one or more reading and pre-reading skills (e.g., testing the student's ability to reproduce, recognize, pronounce, spell, and translate, communication skills necessary for use of the English language, rules of grammar) and for a scorer for determining a

score for each test. See Col. 3:42-53, Col.6: 14-17, 32, Col.7: 51-52, Col.12: 18-25 and Col.13: 32-41. Corder discloses a teacher station into which the portable media is capable of being inserted wherein the teacher station (i.e., teacher's workstation) executes the instructions on the portable media to test one or more skills. See FIG. 2(a). Corder discloses a student computer comprising means for displaying (i.e., student's workstation) at least one of a graphical image and audio associated with each test based on the instructions on the portable media. See FIG. 2(b) and Col.3: 25-28. Corder discloses means for receiving a user response (e.g., voice recording device) to one of the graphical images and audio presented by each test and means (e.g., AppleTalk or Other Network) for communicating the responses for each test back to the teacher station or server computer. See FIGS 2(b)-2(c) and Col.3: 28-30.

2. [Claim 2]: Regarding Claim 2, Corder discloses wherein the station further comprises a recommender (i.e., preliminary evaluator, prescribe module) for recommending, based on the scores (i.e., performance(s)) of the one or more tests, one or more training modules for improving a reading or pre-reading skill of the individual as indicated by the score of the tests. See Col.8: 45-51 and Col.16: 24-42.

3. [Claim 5]: Regarding Claim 5, Corder discloses wherein the user input device of the one or more client computers comprise a speech recognition device for receiving a verbal response from the user to the one or more tests. See Col.3: 67-Col.4:4, Col.10: 36-44, and FIG 2(a), component 242. Digitally recording of voice requires the recognition of speech and the digitized interpretation thereof.

4. [Claims 6, 10]: Regarding Claim 6, Corder discloses wherein the one or more tests comprise a rhyme recognition generation test comprising means for generating a stimulus and means for receiving a response from the user identifying a sound that rhymes with the stimulus (i.e., using rhyming words to complete sentences). See Col.14: 4.

5. [Claim 7]: Regarding Claim 7, Corder discloses wherein the tests further comprise a rhyme recognition test further comprising means for providing at least two stimuli to the user and means for receiving user input in response to the at least two stimuli to determine the user's ability to recognize rhyming words. See Col.13: 64. Regardless of whether or not Corder uses rhyming recognition to test the user's hearing channel, Corder discloses a rhyme recognition test (i.e., recognizing rhyming words). A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention (i.e., to determine the user's ability to recognize rhyming words) must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention form the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

6. [Claim 8]: Regarding Claim 8, Corder discloses wherein the tests further comprise a test for recognizing the beginning sound of a stimulus, the test comprising means for generating at least one stimulus having at least an initial phoneme (i.e., beginning sound) and means for receiving a response to the stimulus that indicates an ability of the test taker to recognize the initial phoneme of the stimulus. See Col.14: 1.

7. [Claim 9]: Regarding Claim 9, Corder discloses wherein the tests further comprise a test for recognizing the ending sound of a stimulus, the test comprising a means for generating at least one stimulus having at least an ending phoneme (i.e., ending sound) and means for receiving a response to the stimulus that indicates an ability of the test taker to recognize the ending phoneme of the stimulus. See Col.14:2.

8. [Claim 12]: Regarding Claim 12, Corder discloses wherein the tests further comprises a sound segmentation test (i.e., identifying syllables in words) comprising means for generating at least one stimulus and means for receiving a response to the stimulus comprising means for segmenting the stimulus into smaller units in order to test the ability to segment the stimulus into smaller units. See Col.14: 5. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention (i.e., in order to test the ability to segment the stimulus into smaller segments) must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

9. [Claim 19]: Regarding Claim 19, Corder discloses wherein the instructions on the portable media further comprises means for motivating the user to complete the tests (e.g., environmental sounds). See Col.13: 32-41.

10. [Claim 20]: Regarding Claim 20, Corder discloses wherein the motivation means further comprises means for generating a graphical image and an associated sound to motivate the user to complete the test. See Col.14: 45-48.

11. [Claim 21]: Regarding Claim 21, Corder discloses wherein the motivation means further comprises means for generating the graphical image and associated sound after a first predetermined number of tests are completed and means for generating another graphical image and associated sound after a second predetermined number of test are completed. See Col.14: 19-26.

12. [Claim 23]: Regarding Claim 23, the motivation means in Corder is capable of comprising means for generating the graphical image and associated sound after a third predetermined number of tests. See Col.14: 19-26.

13. [Claim 24]: Regarding Claim 24, Corder discloses wherein the recommender further comprises means for downloading (i.e., network) the recommended training module from the teacher station to the student computer. See FIG 2(c).

14. [Claim 25]: Regarding Claim 25, Corder discloses wherein the recommender further comprises means for storing (i.e., storage means) the incorrect responses to the one or more test and means (i.e., preliminary evaluation) for generating a training module recommendation based on the incorrect responses. See Col.3: 28-30 and Col.8: 47-51.

15. [Claims 26-27]: Regarding Claims 26 and 27, Corder discloses wherein the recommender further comprises means for comparing each incorrect response (i.e., number of unsuccessful tries) to one or more error measures (inherent) to identify an error (e.g., deficiency in identifying certain sound/object pairs) associated with each incorrect response and means for generating a training module recommendation based on the identified error and wherein the comparing means further comprises means for

identifying one or more errors for each incorrect response (i.e., analyze module). See Col.16: 63-Col.16: 3, 24-42.

16. [Claim 28]: Regarding Claim 28, Corder discloses wherein the recommender further comprises means for identifying a deficient skill by comparing the identified error to a deficient skill rule (inherent) and means for generating a training module recommendation based on the identified deficient skill (i.e., prescribe module). See Col.16: 24-36.

17. [Claim 29]: Regarding Claim 29, Corder discloses wherein the teacher station further comprises means for dynamically generating one or more data reports that illustrate the data associated with the one or more tests (e.g., recording the student's responses to the stimuli through the input means to the storage means of the computer). See Col.3: 29-30 and Col.8: 21-28.

18. [Claim 33]: Regarding Claim 33, Corder discloses wherein the data report generator further comprises a user interface (e.g., a copy of the test screen) for browsing other test data for a user. See Col.12: 36-42.

19. [Claim 34]: Regarding Claim 34, Corder discloses wherein the data report generator further comprises means (e.g., a bar chart) for determining the number of user test results shown. See Col.12: 36-42.

20. [Claim 35]: Regarding Claim 35, Corder discloses wherein the data report generator further comprises means (i.e., LaserWriter IINT Printer) for permitting the user to select a data report print format (e.g., bar chart). See Col.12: 36-42 and FIG. 2(c).

21. [Claim 36]: Regarding Claim 36, Corder discloses wherein the data report generator further comprises means for permitting the user to select a data report display format (e.g., bar chart). This would have been an inherent feature of Corder's invention. See Col.12: 36-42.

22. [Claim 37]: Regarding Claim 37, Corder discloses wherein the data report generator further comprises means for generating a data report (i.e., student's performance) for one or more students in a class, means (e.g., analyze module) for generating a data report for one or more classes each having one or more students and means for generating a data report for a school having one or more classes. See Col.8: 21-27 and Col.16: 36-42.

23. [Claim 40]: Regarding Claim 40, Corder discloses wherein each student computer further comprises means for connecting to the teacher station and means for downloading the resources necessary to execute the current test when the test is started (i.e., AppleTalk or Other Network). See FIG. 2(c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Protopapas et al. (US 5,868,683).

[Claim 3-4]: Regarding Claim 3 and 4, Corder does not disclose expressly wherein the teacher station further comprises a questionnaire (i.e., RD-predictive acoustical test) having one or more questions (i.e., asking the user to respond whether they perceive a pair of tonal stimuli to have the same or different frequencies) for eliciting information about risk factors (e.g., difficulties in mapping a particular sound to a speech sound in the mind) associated with language-based learning disabilities and wherein the information comprises historical data about reading-related risk factors including one or more of medical conditions including chronic otitis media, family history data including history of dyslexia, environmental data including socioeconomic status and exposure to literacy at home and observational data (i.e., a person encountering difficulty in mapping a particular spoken sound to a speech sound in the mind) about an individual's behavior reflecting competencies in speech and sound awareness. However, Protopapas teaches such in Col.4: 11-24 and Col.5: 27-36. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Protopapas in order to treat a reading deficit in a human being.

Claims 11, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Block et al. (US 6,305,942).

1. [Claim 11]: Regarding Claim 11, Corder does not disclose expressly wherein the tests further comprise a sound blender test comprising means for generating at least two sound stimuli and means for receiving a user response to the at least two stimuli, the response indicating an ability to blend the at least two sound stimuli into a larger sound unit. However, Block teaches such (i.e., The highlighting cursor is utilized in the video and the interactive computer display to help students learn how the sounds blend with the words ... each sound of the combination of sounds is audibly demonstrated. Next the entire word is stated for the student to repeat.). See Col.7:1-9. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a sound blender test into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Block, in order to help students learn how sounds blend with words.

2. [Claim 13]: Regarding Claim 13, Corder does not disclose expressly wherein the tests comprise a sound manipulation test comprising means for generating a sound stimulus having one or more sound units and means, in response to the sound stimulus, for manipulating the sound units of the sound stimulus to test the ability to manipulate sound units. However, Block teaches such (i.e., Next the entire word is stated for the student to repeat. Students then read and write the words in their workbooks, so they know how to spell them). See Col.7: 1-9. The student's mouth (used to repeat) and the writing mechanism the student uses to write the words are considered to be means for manipulating sound units. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a sound manipulation test into

the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Block, in order to help students learn how sounds blend with words.

3. [Claim 15]: Regarding Claim 15, Corder discloses means (i.e., voice recording device) for speaking the verbal response into the speech recognition device for receiving and interpreting a verbal response from the user. See Col.3:67-Col.4:4, Col.10: 36-44, and FIG. 2A, component 242. Digitally recording of voice requires the recognition of speech and the digitized interpretation thereof.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Jenkins et al. (US 6,331,115).

[Claim 14]: Regarding Claim 14, Corder does not disclose expressly a verbal recall test comprising means for generating at least one sound stimulus and means, in response to the at least one sound stimulus, for receiving a user response indicating the recalling of at least one sound stimulus (i.e., via selecting at least one corresponding tile that plays the same auditory phoneme). However, Jenkins teaches such in Col.3: 31-41. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Jenkins, in order to train short-term memory.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Corder (US 5,302,132), hereafter referred to as '132.

[Claim 16]: Regarding Claim 16, Corder does not disclose expressly wherein the tests further comprise a naming test comprising means (i.e., first phonogram screen) for generating at least one visual stimulus (e.g., "b") and means, in response to the display of the visual stimulus, for speaking the name of or the sound associated with the visual stimulus (i.e., microphone) using the speech recognition device (i.e., voice analysis). However, '132 teaches such in Col.20: 5-50. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of '132, in order to teach phonics.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Walker (US 5,421,731).

[Claim 17]: Regarding Claim 17, Corder does not disclose expressly a word decoder test comprising means for displaying a visual stimulus to the user and means, in response to the visual stimulus (i.e., a word), for receiving a response from the user to determine the ability to read the visual stimulus (i.e., verifying a pronunciation of a word). However, Walker teaches such in Col.1: 49-57 and Col.2: 5-9. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a word decoder test into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Walker, in order to teach reading.

Claims 22 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Truluck et al. (US 6,353,447).

[Claims 22, 30-32]: Regarding Claims 22 and 30-32, Corder does not disclose expressly wherein the generating means further comprises means for generating a graphical image indicating the number of tests (i.e., activities) remaining to be completed, wherein the data reports further comprises means for displaying the test results (i.e., scores) simultaneously for one or more students, wherein the displaying means further comprises means for displaying the percentage of correct responses (i.e., percentage correct) for a test, wherein the displaying means further comprises means for displaying the results for one or more different test for each user wherein the results for each test are displayed in a different color (i.e., completed activities are displayed differently (e.g., shaded or different color) from incomplete activities). However, Truluck teaches such in FIG.6, Col.1: 48-55, and Col.5: 23-67-Col.6: 15. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Truluck, in order to indicate a user's progress.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Haff et al. (US 6,219,669).

[Claim 39]: Regarding Claim 39, Corder does not disclose expressly wherein the teacher station further comprises means for detecting a break in the communication between the teacher station and the server computer and means for resending any test

data that was not sent due to the communications break. However, Haff teaches such in Col.28: 14-26. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Haff, in order to resume the transmission of a file depending on what portion of the file was previously received.

Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Remschel (US 6,411,796).

1. [Claims 41-42, 44]: Regarding Claims 41-42 and 44, Corder does not disclose wherein the teacher station further comprises means for generating a classroom layout showing an icon for each student computer (i.e., an illustration of the main window of the software showing seat numbers of the student stations), wherein the teacher station further comprises means for controlling each student computer (i.e., graphical user interface), wherein generating the layout further comprises means for coloring each icon depending on the state of testing for the particular student computer. However, Remschel teaches such in FIG. 7, Col.3: 19-20, Abstract, and Col.6: 12-25. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Remschel, in order to enable ease of use of the learning system.

2. [Claim 43]: Regarding Claim 43, Corder discloses wherein the teacher station further comprises means (i.e., storage means) for collecting student test data. See Col.12: 11-25, 46-50.

Claims 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corder in view of Sonnenfeld (US 6,112,049).

[Claims 45-47]: Regarding Claims 45-47, Corder does not disclose expressly wherein the teacher station further comprises means for generating one or more separate accounts, wherein the accounts include a lead teacher (e.g., test administrator) for managing the use of the diagnostic system by one or more classroom teachers in a particular school and one or more classroom teachers who each administer the diagnostic testing for a particular class of students, wherein the teacher station further comprises means for each lead teacher to register one or more classroom teachers who administer the test and means for each classroom teacher (e.g., test designer) to register one or more students who are taking the test, wherein the lead teacher has access to testing data for the entire school and each classroom teacher has access to testing data for the students in the class of the classroom teacher. However, Sonnenfeld teaches such in Col.9: 64-65 and Col.15: 33-37, 55-57. The lead teacher and the classroom teacher are considered a part of upper management. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Corder, in light of the teaching of Sonnenfeld, in order to provide an automated testing system allowing design and administration of hierarchical testing scheme.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Ciarallo et al. (US 6,704,541)

  -tracking the progress of students in a class

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanda L. Harris whose telephone number is 703-308-8358. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Hughes can be reached on 703-308-1806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chanda L. Harris
Examiner
Art Unit 3714

ch.